DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 083 HE 012 337

AUTHOR	Lunney, Gerald H.; Watters, Eric D.
TITLE	The Independent Sector and Statewide Planning for Higher Education: Suggestions for Implementing the Data Brokerage Function in the State Association.
INSTITUTION	Kentucky Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, Danville.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	33p.; For related documents, see HE 012 335-336
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities, Danville, KY 40422
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Data Analysis; *Data Bases; Data Collection; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Management Information Systems; Policy Formation; *Private Colleges; *Professional Associations; Program Descriptions; State Government; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Kentucky; National Center for Higher Education Management; *State Level Information Base

ABSTRACT

Suggestions for developing a data brokerage capability for state associations are offered, based on an investigation by the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities of the data system developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management. Since this data system (the State Level Information Base (SLIB)) was externally developed, the Council sought to determine its relevance for independent colleges. The Council also sought to develop procedures for including the independent sector in any planning activities that would take place in the states as they implemented SLIB. Policy recommendations made by the Council are summarized. It was concluded that independent colleges and universities, through their state associations, must develop data analysis and planning capacity that is free-standing from governmental agencies. A description of the research committee established within the Council to direct the data brokerage function for the state association is included. A brief conference paper on the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), an outline of HEGIS data elements, and a summary of the final SLIB structure for data needs and collection are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183083

Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities

Danville, Kentucky 40422

Telephone 606/236-3533

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council of Independent Ky Colleges & Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE012 337

THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR AND STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DATA BROKERAGE FUNCTION IN THE STATE ASSOCIATION

by

Gerald H. Lunney

and

Eric D. Watters

Copyright ©1980 by
Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities

MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT KENTUCKY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Dr. Jerry C. Davis, President, Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Kentucky 41844
Dr. Dennis F. Kinlaw, President, Asbury College, Wilmore, Kentucky 40390
Dr. Eugene V. Petrik, President, Bellarmine College, Louisville, Kentucky 40205
Dr. Willis D. Weatherford, President, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky 40404
Sister George Ann Cecil, President, Brescia College, Owensboro, Kentucky 42301
Dr. W. R. Davenport, President, Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, Kentucky 42718
Dr. Thomas A. Spragens, President, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky 40422
Dr. James M. Boswell, President, Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Kentucky 40769
Dr. Ben M. Elrod, President, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky 40324
Dr. Luther W. White, III, President, Kentucky Wesleyan College Owensboro, Kentucky 42301
Dr. Troy R. Eslinger, President, Lees Junior College, Jackson, Kentucky 41339
Dr. John B. Begley, President, Lindsey Wilson College, Columbia, Kentucky 42728
Dr. Nelson M. Hoffman, Jr., President, Midway College, Midway, Kentucky 40347
Dr. Jackson O. Hall, President, Pikeville College, Pikeville, Kentucky 41501
Sister Catherine Mahady, President, St. Catharine College, St. Catharine, Kentucky 40061
Sister Eileen M. Egan, President, Spalding College, Louisville, Kentucky 40203
Dr. Earl F. Hays, President, Sue Bennett College, London, Kentucky 40741
Dr. Robert J. Giroux, President, Thomas More College, Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky 41017
Dr. William W. Kelly, President, Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky 40508
Dr. Mahlon A. Miller, President, Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky 40906

KENTUCKY FORD FOUNDATION PROJECT
December, 1977 -- December, 1979

NATIONAL PANEL

Robert C. Bowie, Vice President for Finance and Management Systems, Johns Hopkins University
Virginia Fadil, Director of Research, National Institute for Independent Colleges and Universities
Hans Jenny, Vice President for Finance, Business and Budgeting, College of Wooster
Larry Litten, Director of Research, Consortium on Financing Higher Education
James Olliver, Director of Research, North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

STATE TASK FORCE

Willis Weatherford, President, Berea College, Chairman
Ruth Blackburn, Registrar, Transylvania University
Jonnie Blair, Director of Institutional Planning, Lees Junior College (1978-79)
Barry Dixon, Director of Personnel Services, Centre College
Robert Epley, Assistant to the President, Union College (1977-78)
William Hovenden, Dean, Alice Lloyd College (1977-78)
John O. Kampschaefer, Vice President for Financial Affairs, Bellarmine College
Roger Kusche, Dean, Asbury College (1978-79)
Elinor Starr, Director of Student Financial Aid, Spalding College

PROJECT STAFF

John W. Frazer, Executive Director, CIKCU
Gerald H. Lunney, Director of Research, CIKCU, Project Director
Eric D. Watters, Research Associate

Acknowledgements

The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities is deeply grateful to the Ford Foundation and to Dr. Fred Crossland, not only for providing the financial capability to attempt this project, but for the foresight and concern they have displayed in regard to the independent sector of higher education.

The project also owes much to the members of the National Panel for the challenges they put forth and the guidance and support they offered in our quest to address those challenges.

Also to be commended are the efforts of the State Task Force. These individuals contributed insight and expertise, in addition to hard work, that propelled the undertaking and gave it substance.

Our appreciation is extended, in addition, to Mr. John Frazer whose keen understanding of higher education and steady hand in appraising and confronting its matters, served both to encourage and direct the work of the project.

Finally, our thanks go to Audrey Davenport whose tireless typing and patient "proofing" were of invaluable service to the endeavor.

Eric D. Watters
Gerald H. Lunney
January, 1980

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Operational Recommendations	5

Appendices

A. The Data Brokerage Function for the State Association	11
B. The Structure and Responsibilities of the CIKCU Research Committee	15
C. About That Data Base That is Hiding in the Closet	19
D. Summary of the Final SLIB Structure	31

Introduction

In the Spring of 1977 the Ford Foundation announced that it had inaugurated a request for proposals from state associations of independent colleges and universities to address issues having policy implications for the associations or their member institutions. The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities (CIKCU) was awarded a two-year grant in December 1977 to examine the policy implications of the State Level Information Base (SLIB) project of the National Center for Higher Education Management.

Kentucky, through the Kentucky Council on Higher Education (KCHE), was one of the pilot states in the SLIB Project. Since CIKCU has had a long history of involvement with the KCHE in statewide planning for higher education, the Council watched the development of this project with interest. The original purpose of the SLIB project was to develop a comprehensive and coordinated set of data elements which could serve each state's higher education agency as it developed and expanded its planning activities. The field review edition of the SLIB planning manual was distributed about the same time that the Ford Foundation announced its grant program. In the opinion of the CIKCU staff and others, SLIB at its stage of development in 1977 was not properly sensitive to independent higher education and its concerns for statewide planning.

The project which CIKCU proposed and which the Ford Foundation funded entailed conducting a comprehensive review of SLIB, to study its implications for independent higher education and to develop procedures for including the independent sector in any planning activities which would take place in the states as their higher education agencies implemented SLIB. In addition to staff efforts CIKCU's project involved a national panel of experts who could provide a wide perspective to the project and represent concerns beyond Kentucky and a state task force of practitioners who represented the people who would ultimately be providing the institutional planning data to the state agency.

Many things have occurred since the project began in December of 1977. There has been a major shift in emphasis in SLIB. The final product of that project is not a set of data elements which states could adopt and which would serve as a basis for interstate data sharing. SLIB has evolved into a framework for statewide planning. The emphasis is now on the policy considerations which must be answered in the individual states as each develops its higher education planning activities. The final product helps in these policy considerations and then provides direction as the state proceeds from its response to these questions to implementing a planning system.

The direction of Kentucky's Ford project has also changed. As originally conceived, the stance was defensive. Midway through the project, all concerned reached the conclusion that a pro-active stance would be much more appropriate and beneficial for the independent sector to take in its involvement in statewide planning. The second year of the project has been committed to the development of a model for this pro-active stance, a model in which the state association of independent colleges and universities assumes the function of "broker" for data concerning independent institutions as these institutions become involved in statewide planning.

A detailed description of Kentucky's Ford project entitled The Independent Sector and Statewide Planning for Higher Education: The Data Initiative has been published. In addition CIKCU has published a summary of the policy recommendations developed in the project. The title of that paper is The Independent Sector and Statewide Planning for Higher Education: Some Policy Considerations for the 1980's. The purpose of that paper is to review the reasons for developing the data brokerage capability which was recommended as a result of the project. These suggestions are based on the structure of CIKCU and experience in Kentucky but they should be adaptable to other states.

The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities undertook the project which led to the recommendations described in this paper because of a strong conviction that independent colleges and universities must be involved with statewide planning for higher education. If anything, that conviction has been further strengthened during the life of the project. This has come not only from the thoughts of the National Panel, the work of the State Task Force or the efforts of the staff, but from external forces as well.

Recent economic trends and the realities of demography over the next several years are two of these forces. The pressures on higher education in general and on the state higher education agencies (Coordinating Boards, Planning Councils, etc.) in particular will be enormous. In most states, the public sector is by far the greater part of higher education. For this reason, as well as the concerns related to the expenditure of public monies, most of these agencies' time and energy will be spent on planning for the state-supported institutions. Relations between state agencies and independent institutions range from active cooperation through benign neglect to open hostility. Even in the most positive situations, however, the pressures will militate against much planning involving independent colleges and universities.

These realities lead to the basic conclusion reached by the parties who worked on this project:

> Independent colleges and universities, through their state associations, must develop data analysis and planning capacity which is free standing from governmental agencies.

Two policy recommendations were developed to relate the efforts of the independent sector to the planning activities of the state agency. They are:

> Recommendation #1. A policy document describing the relationship between independent higher education and the state higher education planning agency should be developed and approved by the policy boards of both the state agency and the state association of independent colleges and universities.
>
> Recommendation #2. In determining what information and data elements concerning independent colleges and universities should be provided to state agencies, and to assure that the benefits to the institutions will be commensurate with the cost of their provision, the state agency should frame its requests and the independent institutions weigh such requests according to the following criteria:
>
> a) The only data that should be provided are data for planning.
> b) Data definitions should be in terms of institutionally useful data.
> c) Only data for which there is a currently demonstrated need should be provided.

The third recommendation developed by the project has both policy and operational implications. This and the other two recommendations will be described in the next section of the paper.

Operational Recommendations

The Brokerage Function: A key element to the successful involvement of independent institutions in statewide planning is a point of focus within the independent sector which can facilitate the gathering of data from the schools while insulating them from unreasonable data demands and which can, because of that focus, be aware of the policy implications of data requests while being sensitive to the overall planning process. This data brokerage function, described in detail in Appendix A is a natural extension of the current role of the state association of independent colleges and universities. In fact, this recommendation is the primary recommendation in this report and flows directly from the conclusion which was reached in this project.

> Recommendation #3. The state association should serve as a broker for data concerning independent higher education. The brokerage responsibility would function, not only as a means of implementing and affirming the independent institutions' relationship with the state agency and other external agencies, but would also facilitate self-initiated planning activities among the independent institutions.

Data Management: In order to adequately implement Recommendation #3, a mechanism must be established to provide the state association with the technical expertise and experience to perform the data brokerage role for the institutions. This is especially true when the association has only one professional on staff or staff lacks expertise in research design and computer applications. Even with these staff capabilities, however, the association needs to be sensitive to the data demands and data needs at the individual institutions. Appendix B describes the Research Committee which was established within the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges

and Universities because of this project. This committee is the mechanism, the structure within Kentucky which will direct the data brokerage function for the association. Depending on the particular state association, this structure would need to be altered to accommodate the association capabilities.

Capability in research methodology and computer applications would seem vital to the mechanism however it was implemented. An extremely sensitive area which would need to be addressed concerns the collection and storage of the data which the association would gather. There would need to be a certain amount of mutual trust if one institution were to provide the computer capacity for the association. An alternative possibility, probably expensive, would be the use of an independent computer service bureau. The main point is that this question would need to be faced early in the process of developing the state association's research committee.

> Recommendation #4. In order to meet its data brokerage responsibility the state association must establish a mechanism to utilize the expertise and experience of the institutions to guide and direct the association's data analysis and planning activities.

Data Utilization: Institutions currently complete numerous surveys for the state and federal government. If properly analyzed, these surveys can yield important planning information. In addition, significant savings could be realized if studies are made from regularly completed surveys. For a more detailed discussion of the potential which exists for research based on government surveys, see Appendix C.

If the independent sector's planning activities extend beyond these government surveys, one possible source of a structure for planning and

for survey instruments is the final report of the State Level Information Base Project of NCHEMS. A list of the planning concerns suggested by SLIB is presented in Appendix D.

> Recommendation #5. The projects undertaken in fulfillment of the brokerage function, by whatever mechanism is established to implement that function, should be based on currently gathered data, if possible. Only when an area of concern falls outside of any current survey's information potential should a different form be selected or developed.

APPENDICES

The Data Brokerage Function for the State Association

The importance of the data brokerage role for the state association rests in the power of joint, cooperative action. In most states, each independent college is small. Considered together, however, the independent institutions represent a large entity within a state's higher education community; larger than many of the state institutions. Singly, an institution would be reluctant to disregard a data request from a governmental agency. Singly, an institution would have difficulty shaping the nature and form of that request. Singly, an institution might not have the resources to conduct comprehensive institutional research; even if it did it would not have a context for judging its data. Singly, institutions spend too much time responding to data requests. Together, the institutions can develop a group response to a data request. Together, they can work to shape the nature and form of the request. Together, by pooling resources, they can conduct institutional research and obtain data from sister institutions which provide a context for self-evaluation. Together the institutions could form a data base which could serve as a source of information for the multitude of persons who request data from them. A logical place for the management of this cooperative action is the state association of independent colleges and universities. The data brokerage function is a translation into the area of data analysis and planning of the rationale which led originally to the formation of the state associations.

The number of survey forms which reach the various offices of a college campus is monumental. Institutional time and resources must be used to complete the forms, scarce resources that the institution needs for other purposes. The good will and accuracy with which the forms are completed varies from person to person and time to time depending on a variety of circumstances. In addition, the information gathered in a survey might be damaging to an institution if it is misused or put in an improper context. One part of the data brokerage function is to develop an awareness on the part of the association staff of the various surveys and questionnaires which go to colleges. By knowing the nature of these data requests, advice can be given to the individual institutions concerning the policy implications, importance and duplication of various surveys and questionnaires. The advisory nature of the data brokerage activity must be emphasized. The establishment of the state association as a data broker should not reduce the institution's freedom or responsibility in the area of data analysis and planning. The purpose of the brokerage function is to provide services to the institutions which they could not obtain individually. The use of the services is always at the discretion of the institutions.

Once the awareness of the nature of the data requests is developed, the association, as data broker, can begin to negotiate the form and content of the requests so that duplication is eliminated and the questionnaires are as easy as possible for the institutions to complete. The association could also begin to review new requests, testing them in the area of policy implications, importance and duplication.

The most important element of the data brokerage function is the facilitation of cooperatively initiated surveys and research projects. These projects will provide the colleges with institutional and comparative planning data. Cooperative efforts could be more cost effective than individual efforts. As the information from these surveys and projects is gathered, the state association will develop a data base concerning the institutions. In time, this data base could serve as the principal source of information for many people who currently inundate individual institutions with data requests. Of great importance is the fact that the self-initiated studies might eliminate or affect the character of external surveys and questionnaires. If the institutions have collectively studied an area of general concern, they will be in a position of being able to provide information about that area in a form of their own choosing rather than having to fill out another questionnaire.

A last, and significant, point is that the institutions, through the state association, will be able to provide information and not merely data to interested external parties. A major concern in providing data to various requesters is the potential for misinterpretation and misuse. By providing some analysis, sensitive data can be presented in aggregated form without drawing unwarranted attention to any one institution. The financial "softness" of the sector can be demonstrated without listing the condition at any given school.

Individual associations, just as individual institutions, will respond to the role of data broker in different ways. This is part of the genius of the independent sector of higher education. Whatever the response, it seems time to consider the role of data broker as the next step in the development of the state association of independent colleges and universities.

Appendix B

The Structure and Responsibilities of the CIKCU Research Committee

PURPOSE: The CIKCU Research Committee will serve three functions for the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities. 1) To make policy recommendations to the member institutions concerning specific responses to external data requests, especially requests from government agencies; 2) To identify and define the direction of the research efforts internal to CIKCU; and, 3) To oversee and advise the CIKCU research office of its ongoing activities.

STRUCTURE: The CIKCU Research Committee will be appointed by the Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Director. The committee will be generally representative of the member institutions and the major areas of data concern. Persons appointed to the Research Committee will not serve more than three years consecutively.

New members will be appointed at the Fall meeting of the Council and will assume their responsibilities on the following January 1. Ideally, the number of new appointments would be less than half of the committee membership.

While serving as the Ford Project State Task Force, the Research Committee has consisted of seven persons including a President who served as chairman and a Dean who served as vice-chairman. The other member brought experience in business affairs, student records, financial aid, institutional research, student affairs and admissions. Both four year and two year institutions have been represented. This kind of representation has been effective and that fact should be part of the consideration as the executive director recommends new appointments.

PROCEDURE: The Research Committee will have two regularly scheduled meetings each year. The first, in the Spring, will be called to review the standing data requests from governmental agencies, new external data requests and to determine the directions for the internal research efforts for the following academic year. The second meeting, in the late summer or early fall, will be designed to review the instrumentation and design of the new research efforts and to review the previous year's research activities. Since the timing of many data requests will probably not fit this schedule, the Director of Research will circulate all available information concerning the requests and will poll the membership concerning their recommendations. If the response does not represent consensus, special arrangements will be made to eliminate differences between committee members. Under any circumstances, both regular and occasional data requests will be judged against three criteria: 1) The purpose for which the data are being gathered; 2) The value to each institution obtained by participating in the data gathering process; and, 3) The impact upon each institution and it's staff of participating in the process.

Committee members will be expected to inform their peers at other member institutions of the activities of the committee. The committee will solicit suggestions from the institutions concerning possible research activity.

Responsibilities of the Research Office to the Committee:

1) The Director of Research will keep committee members apprised of all activities in the areas of committee oversight.

2) The Director will acquaint new members of their responsibilities and of the status of the committee's activities prior to their becoming active committee members.

3) The office will solicit institutional participation and collect the names of the institutional representatives at those institutions which chose to participate in committee sponsored research activities.

4) The office will be responsible for identifying and/or developing data collection instruments for the Council's internal research efforts.

5) The office will handle routine research matters which do not require policy oversight by the committee.

6) The office will provide administrative support for the committee's activities.

Overriding Principle: The Research Committee is selected by the Council and will in the execution of its responsibilities represent expert sensitivity to the policy considerations of research activities. In order to expedite the implementation of committee decisions, the research office will, upon direction of the committee chairman, act upon those decisions without Council review. This is possible, and reasonable, because each institution will have the opportunity to review the Committee's deliberations and make its own decision concerning participation in any research activity.

About That Data Base That is Hiding in the Closet---

A Contributed Paper Presented at the
Southern Association for Institutional Research Annual Conference
October 25, 1979
by

Gerald H. Lunney
Director of Research
Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities
Box 668, Danville, Kentucky 40422 (606)236-3533

For many small institutions, Institutional Research, a part-time exercise, amounts to a process of scrambling around looking for the answers to questions on some external survey instrument. Once the form is completed and mailed it is forgotten as the person responsible for a particular survey gets back to his or her regular duties or to the next external survey that needs to be completed.

Institutional Research at these institutions is fractured, reactive and consists of repeated return to source data for information. There is little time, energy or effort expended on using data for planning. When the idea of planning data is mentioned, the institution responds, "We don't have time to develop a planning data base, we're too busy filling out the HEGIS report."

But what is the HEGIS survey? It is, in fact, a series of survey instruments which describe several dimensions of colleges and universities. Appendix I is a compilation of the data which institutions voluntarily provide to the National Center for Education Statistics through HEGIS. Appendix II is a document reporting the HEGIS history and descriptions of the various survey instruments which was prepared by NCES in May, 1978.

The question then is, since a general survey of higher education exists and is completed by almost all colleges and universities, does it have any potential for use by a small college as the corpus of a planning data system? My response is, yes, with certain limitations. There are at least two important elements which enhance this possibility. One is consistency. HEGIS has a long enough history to have stabilized its several instruments. For the most common parts, last year's form is identical to this year's survey. In addition, the form is standardized. There are definitions for each data element in the survey. This is not to say that each person who completes a HEGIS form interprets the definitions the same, or that everyone completes the form with the information which is requested. Can we be sure that any completion of a survey meets these criteria?

If one is looking for a student specific data base, one which contains detailed information concerning all students which can be stored, retrieved, and manipulated in order to provide aggregated data on an institution's students, then that person is beyond using HEGIS as the basis for her or his planning data base. The same can be said for a personnel specific data base. It is my presumption that the small institution is at "ground zero"; that it is looking for some way to begin to attack the problem of planning data. At this level HEGIS can be helpful. In two or three years an institution may find that its questions can no longer be answered with HEGIS data. At this point the institution is ready for a more sophisticated planning data base.

I do not wish to create the impression that HEGIS is a complete data system. It has serious gaps. One is in the area of personnel. HEGIS annually collects data concerning only the number, rank and salary of full-time faculty members. The survey occasionally collects data concerning administrative personnel. Nothing is included in HEGIS about part-time faculty members or about other institutional personnel. There is another federal form, the EEO-6 Form which provides a comprehensive picture of each institution's personnel. I would suggest that it be used to supplement HEGIS in the area of personnel for the data base. Surprisingly enough, NCES which is charged to gather data to describe the impact of federal programs, does not include anything in the HEGIS package concerning the utilization of federal student financial aid or questions concerning the type and volume of categorical aid. The "Fisap", the form through which the institution reports utilization of financial aid and makes application for continuation of federal aid monies can help in the former area. The latter is still a void. The real theme of my paper is that regular reports and surveys which the institution completes should be reviewed to see if the information provided to the federal government or some other agency might not be used by the institution for planning. HEGIS is only a convenient example, but others might include a state report or a report to your denomination's Board for Higher Education.

How can HEGIS be used? The first step is to gather all of the forms in one place. I suspect that in the small college HEGIS is completed in at least three places, the registrar's office, the business office and the library. Wherever HEGIS is completed, it is viewed as an isolated and painful chore. The same information in the hands of someone with policy and planning concerns can be a gold mine. (I have, perhaps, left out the REAL first step which is to identify someone with the ability and inclination to turn data into answers to policy and planning concerns.) Don't just gather this year's HEGIS but get the last several years. This helps to meet the next suggestion. Do longitudinal studies with HEGIS data. A single datum might produce an aesthetic response but it is only in some context that data have meaning and power. Look at trends over time to determine if and how the institution has changed. In addition to longitudinal studies, do comparative studies using other institutions' HEGIS data. Every

president carries a list of his or her "benchmarks"; those institutions which are judged to be comparable to the president's and against whose performance her or his institution is contrasted. Use these institutions' data for your studies. Another source of comparable institutions is the institutional characteristics survey in HEGIS. The best way to conduct a comparative study is to communicate with other institutions about your research and agree to share the results if the institutions will provide copies of their reports. This fosters cooperation and communication concerning the ways the institutions are interpreting definitions. A group of institutions might get together and share the responsibility for studies using the various HEGIS forms. If this type of cooperative effort is not feasible, an institution can request copies of HEGIS data from a variety of sources including the National Center for Education Statistics. No data which will identify an individual will be released, but all of the rest of the data are in the public domain.

The obvious best procedure is to do annual cross-institutional studies which will provide both longitudinal and comparative information. From that nasty old HEGIS, which everybody has been complaining about, then completing and forgetting, some fairly powerful studies can be done.

What are some studies which might be undertaken using HEGIS information? One possibility which comes to mind at this time is related to the residence and migration survey which is in HEGIS this year for the first time since 1975-76. With these data and some other follow-up, several questions can be answered: Where do the institution's students come from? Have there been any significant shifts in the past four years? Does the enrollment pattern match the institution's objectives for student diversity? How good is the return on money spent by the admissions office at various locations? Adding demographic data, what are the prospects for maintaining or improving the enrollment pattern observed this year?

Data concerning degrees granted are gathered every year in HEGIS. Many questions can be answered with these data: Does the institution's production of graduates match its purpose? Are there any significant shifts in the disciplines in which degrees are being granted? Are there any policy concerns associated with these shifts? Does the pattern of degrees granted match one's intuitive feeling or empirical knowledge about employment possibilities for the institution's graduates?

Longitudinal studies of enrollment data will provide some information about attrition and retention with obvious policy implications. The same data can help establish targets for succeeding years' enrollments.

Analagous studies can be done using financial data, personnel data, library data, etc. Potential cross-institutional studies are fairly obvious.

Before many years have passed, the institutional researcher will no longer be satisfied with the information which he or she can gleen from HEGIS and will develop a sophisticated planning data system. But to start such a system "cold"..... Isn't it worthwhile to take a look at that HEGIS information that has been gathering dust in the closet all these years?

Appendix I

Outline of HEGIS Data Elements

Form 2300-1 Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities

Name/Address/Phone
Structure (Single Campus, Main Campus, Branch, Unit of Multi-Campus Institution)
Date Established/First College Work Offered/ Degrees First Granted
Accreditation-Regional and Professional
Institutional Control
Sex of Student Body
Calendar
Level of Offerings
Types of Programs
Enrollment
Admissions Requirements
Names and Titles of Academic Officers

2300-2.1/2.2 Degrees and Other Awards

Academic Area by Racial/Ethnic Breakdown by Degree Level by Sex and/or
Academic Field by Degree Level by Sex

2300-2.3 Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report

Academic Area (selected) by Full/Part-Time by Academic Level by Racial/Ethic Breakdown by Sex
or
Full/Part-Time by Academic Level by Sex

2300-2.8 Residence and Migration of College Students

State by Degree/Program Level by Sex
State by First Time Students by Sex
State by Transfer Students by Sex

2300-2.9 Enrollment by Field

No longer collected

2300-3 Employees in Institutions of Higher Education

Titles, Salaries and Sex of Selected Administrators
and/or
Salaries, Tenure and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Institutional Faculty

2300-4 Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education (for previous year)

Current Fund Revenues by Source
Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers by Source
Physical Plant Assets

2300-4 Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education (for previous years) Continued

Indebtedness on Physical Plant
Endowment Assets
Statement of Changes in Fund Balances

From Public Institutions Only (for the Bureau of the Census)

Selected Revenues
Selected Expenditures
Debt Outstanding, Issued, and Retired
Cash and Security Holdings at the End of the Fiscal Year

2300-5 College and University Library

Current Periodical Subscriptions
Library Collections
Staff by Title by Sex by Full/Part-Time with Salaries
Hours of Student Employment in Libraries
Library Usage
Library Hours/Days per Week
Library Finances

2300-7 Inventory of College and University Facilities

Building Inventory - Condition/Ownership/ Year of Construction by Assignable/Gross Square Feet
Total Campus by Room Use Categories by Assignable Square Feet
Total Campus by Room Use and Program Classification Categories by Assignable Square Feet
Accessibility for Handicapped Students

2300-8 Adult and Continuing Education: Non-Credit Activities in Institutions

Institutional Units that Scheduled Non-Credit Activities
Registration in Non-Credit Adult/Continuing Education by Field (and Continuing Professional Education)
Structure and Administration of Continuing Education

HIGHER EDUCATION GENERAL INFORMATION SURVEY (HEGIS)
FORMS SCHEDULED FOR EACH YEAR

From 1979-80 Through 1982-84

Form Number		XIV 1979	XV 1980	XVI 1981	XVII 1982	XVIII 1983
2300-1	Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities	x	x	x	x	x
2300-2.1	Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred between July 1 and June 30	x*	x	x*	x	x*
2300-2.3A	Fall Enrollment in Higher Education (Post card for preliminary data)		x		x	
2300-2.3	Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education	x	x*	x	x*	x
2300-2.8	Residence and Migration of College Students	x		x		x
2300-3	Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-time Instructional Faculty	x	x	x	x	x
2300-4	Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education for Fiscal Year	x	x	x	x	x
2300-5	College and University Libraries	x	x	x	x	x
2300-7	Inventory of College and University Physical Facilities (for the mobility impaired)		x			
2300-8	Adult/Continuing Education: Non-credit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education (Sample Survey)		s**		s**	

*Race/ethnic information required.

**s represents sample survey, all others measure the population.

HISTORY OF NCES POSTSECONDARY SURVEYS

From 1970-71 Through 1978-79

Form Number	HEGIS	V 1970	VI 1971	VII 1972	VIII 1973	IX 1974	X 1975	XI 1976	XII 1977	XIII 1978
2300-1		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2300-2.1		x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x*	x
2300-2.3		x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x	x*
2300-2.8				x			x			
2300-3		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2300-4		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2300-5			x		x		x		x	
2300-7		x	x			x				
2300-8			s**					s**		

*Race/ethnic information required.

**s represents sample survey, all others measure the population.

CONSISTENCY FOR NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (NCES)
POSTSECONDARY SURVEYS

Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS):

Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities:
Information is reported in July to represent status for coming year. Form has been fairly consistent in structure over the years. Changes have involved variance to the accrediting agencies listed, to the list of administrators to be included, and to the classification of institutions for published information. No change to the form is anticipated in the near future.

Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1 and June 30:
Information is required of the previous year.
(Different forms are used for two-year institutions versus four-year institutions.)
Form has been fairly consistent in structure. Major change has been the addition of racial information for 10 selected programs in 1976-77. Racial data were required again in 1977-78 and then became required biennially in odd years. The form will stay the same with racial areas shaded in years racial data are not required.

Fall Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education or (in even years) Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education:
Information is reported for the current Fall term.
Form has become consistent in the past few years with the major changes being the addition of racial information in 1976-77.
Racial data will be required every other year in even years; and when it is required separate forms for 10 selected instructional program areas must be filled out. The form will stay the same with racial areas shaded in years racial data are not required.

Residence and Migration of College Students:
Information is required for the current Fall Term.
Due to the nature of this data it is only collected every three to four years. The form may be required again in 1979-80, but there will be different definitions and the form may be limited to First-Time Freshmen and New Undergraduate Transfers.

Upper Division and Post-Baccalaureate Enrollment by Degree Field (previously entitled Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees prior to 1975-76):
Information is reported for the current Fall term.
Upper division enrollment was collected in 1967, 1975, and 1976 only, but enrollments for advanced degrees were collected every year. There are no further plans to collect information on enrollments by degree field.

Employees in Institutions of Higher Education or entitled Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty (when information on all employees is not collected):
Information is required for staff employed annually and on the payroll as of October 1.
Information collected on employees other than faculty has been very inconsistent and in lieu of trying to collect this information again, NCES will be trying to use the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Employment Survey. Faculty information collected has been fairly consistent, however. The major change was the inclusion of information previously collected by AAUP on salaries for continuing faculty in the 1977-78 form.

Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education:
Information is required for the previous fiscal year.
For 1975-76 the HEGIS financial definitions and form became compatible with the Higher Education Finance Manual (HEFM) and College and University Business Administration (CUBA). (This causes financial data collection in previous years to be incompatible with financial data collected from 1975 on.) A change in 1978-79 will be the dropping of Part G (the last page of the survey) which was required of public institutions for Bureau of the Census purposes in 1977-78. There may be future modifications to the form and definitions but they will be worked out with NACUBO.

College and University Libraries:
Information is required as of the Fall term.
Special data are sometimes required, but generally the form has been fairly consistent.

Inventory of College and University Facilities:
Information has been required as of September of the survey year.
This form has not been collected since 1974, and it will be changing to collect information on accessibility to higher education facilities for handicapped students--probably by student programs. A feasibility study using selected institutions will be conducted in 1978-79, and the full survey of all institutions will be conducted in 1980-81.

Adult/Continuing Education: Non-Credit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education:

Information is required for the previous full fiscal year.

A stratified sample of higher education institutions is selected to participate in survey years. (Surveys have been done in 1968 for 1967-68, in 1976 for 1975-76, and will be done in 1978 for 1977-78.) Additionally, in 1971, 65 selected institutions were asked to respond about training programs they had for adult education.

Postsecondary Education Forms not part of HEGIS:

Postsecondary Career School Survey:

Information is reported regarding any changes since the last biennial survey.

This biennial survey was begun in 1970 to collect data on non-collegiate postsecondary schools (not required to report in HEGIS) which provide occupational training; and the survey results in a biennial publication of directories. (This form sometimes goes to state agencies and sometimes goes directly to institutions, depending upon the state agency's agreement with NCES.)

Vocational Education Data System(VEDS):

Information will be reported for the previous year of July 1-June 30.

This survey will be filled out by state agencies (sometimes higher education and sometimes vocational/technical education agencies) to represent the total state and will not be collected from institutions or represent individual institutions. A feasibility study was conducted using 8 states in 1977-78 (for 1976-77 data), and a full survey of all states will be conducted in 1979 (for 1978-79 data). States will still have to provide vocational education data in 1978-79 to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE) using its standard forms.

Summary of the Final SLIB Structure

The Selection of Data to Address Planning Issues, the SLIB document that deals specifically with data needs and collection, focuses on four major areas and suggests the following general questions:

Need/Demand for Postsecondary-Education Services:

A. What are the collective needs of the citizens in the state?

- Can employment patterns in particular occupations be analyzed to determine if there is a labor shortage or labor surplus?
- Are there particular educational and training programs in which the state wants to promote a specific labor interest?
- Can changes be made to allow for broader accessibility to postsecondary education?
- Are there special activities in research and public service that can be provided through postsecondary-education resources and facilities, once specific state-level needs have been identified?

B. What is the individual demand in the state for access to postsecondary-education programs/institutions and the potential opportunities to be derived?

Responsiveness of the Postsecondary-Education Enterprise:

A. What are the characteristics of programs and institutions available in the state (kinds, sizes, geographic location, quality)?

B. What changes might be required to the existing postsecondary-education structure in regard to:

- Addition or deletion of programs/institutions?
- Improvement of quality/prestige of programs/institutions?
- Sharing of program resources within an institution and/or among institutions?
- Expansion from traditional higher-education concepts to an understanding of broader postsecondary-education needs?

Resources Required to Support the Postsecondary-Education Enterprises:

A. What are the amount, characteristics, and utilization of current resources (finances, personnel, facilities)?

B. Can areas be identified where qualitative and quantitative improvement can be made?

C. If there is a change in emphasis or demand, will additional resources be needed, or can utilization of existing resources be improved?

Financial Policies Related to the Acquisition and Distribution of Resources:

A. What proportion of costs are to be borne by the state versus other sources, such as local governments, students, and so forth?

B. To what extent will different financing policies apply to different kinds of institutions, programs, and services?

C. What mechanism will be used for distribution of state funds (that is, how much will be distributed directly to institutions versus indirectly through programs of student financial aid)?

D. How does the effect of resource-allocation procedures compare to the intent of the financing policies?

The CIKCU-Ford Task Force affirms the importance of these issues to the statewide planning process, while stressing that prudence be exercised in the adoption of particular data requests to address those issues.